

APPENDIX 6: PLANNING AREA DETAIL

The working draft Appendix contains details of the proposed concepts applicable to each of the Plan's twelve subareas, or Planning Areas, within the planned urban area north of Palm Avenue.

The purpose of the draft Planning Area Detail Appendix is to explain the proposed protection of natural resources, planned land uses, public areas ("public realm"), urban design requirements, and minimum development capacities of the twelve subareas.

The working draft Appendix presents working ideas to create walkable, transit friendly, mixed use neighborhoods and workplaces based on the environmental characteristics of the Valley.

The working draft Planning Areas Detail Appendix is a work in progress, and is being made available at this time for community and stakeholder input. It is an unfinished document, and it is hoped that its early release would encourage significant input. Major modifications to the Appendix are expected as a result of community input, the findings of the EIR and refinements to the Specific Plan.

The working draft Appendix is available on the front page of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan website (<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/coyotevalley>) under What's New section.

Note: There are some variations between the draft Appendix land use concept and the conceptual land use plan (consistent with the project description for the CVSP Environmental Impact Report) contained in this Initial Draft CVSP. Where there are notable variations between the two land use concepts, the "project description" land use concept has precedence to maintain the integrity of the EIR.

PLEASE SEE
FOLDOUT.PDF,
PAGE 3

APPENDIX 9: TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The following

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures should be used to promote transit use and pedestrian activity and should be incorporated into all new development within the Coyote Valley Specific Plan:

Residential Measures**Site Design Measures**

- Construct transit amenities such as bus turnouts/bus bulbs, benches, shelters, etc.
- Provide direct, safe, attractive pedestrian access from project land uses to transit stops and adjacent development.
- Provide bicycle lanes, sidewalks and/or paths, connecting project residences to adjacent schools, parks, the nearest transit stop and nearby commercial areas.
- Provide secure and conveniently placed bicycle parking and storage facilities at parks and other facilities.
- Provide neighborhood-serving shops and services within or adjacent to residential project.
- Provide a satellite telecommute center within or near the development.
- Incorporate commercial services onsite or in close proximity (e.g. day-care, drycleaners, fitness centers, financial services, grocery stores and/or restaurant).

Operational Measures

- Provide transit information kiosks;
- Provide shuttle access to regional rail stations (e.g. Caltrain, ACE, BART);
- Provide or contract for on-site or nearby child care services;

- Offer transit use incentive programs to residents, such as distribution of passes and/or subsidized transit passes for a local transit system (e.g. providing VTA EcoPass system or equivalent broad spectrum transit passes to all residents).

Commercial, Mixed Use and Industrial Measures**Site Design Measures**

- Incorporate physical improvements, such as sidewalk improvements, landscaping and bicycle parking that act as incentives for pedestrian and bicycle modes of travel.
- Provide secure and conveniently located bicycle parking and storage for employees and visitors;
- Provide bicycle and pedestrian connections from the site to the bikeway, pedestrian and trail system.
- Place assigned car pool and van pool parking spaces at the most desirable on-site locations;
- Provide showers and lockers for employees walking or bicycling to work.
- Incorporate commercial services onsite or in close proximity (e.g. day-care, drycleaners, fitness centers, financial services, grocery stores and/or restaurants).

Operational Measures

- Provide an on-site TDM coordinator;
- Provide transit information kiosks;
- Make transportation available during the day and guaranteed ride home

programs for emergency use by employees who commute on alternate transportation. (This service may be provided by access to company vehicles for private errands during the workday and/or combined with contractual or pre-paid use of taxicabs, shuttles, or other privately provided transportation.);

- Provide vans for van pools;
- Implementation of a carpool/vanpool program (e.g., carpool ridematching for employees, assistance with vanpool formation, provision of vanpool vehicles, and car-sharing);
- Provide shuttle access to regional rail stations (e.g. Caltrain, ACE, BART);
- Provide or contract for on-site or nearby child care services;
- Offer transit use incentive programs to employees, such as on site distribution of passes and/or subsidized transit passes for a local transit system (e.g. providing VTA EcoPass system or equivalent broad spectrum transit passes to all on-site employees);
- Implementation of parking cash out program for employees (non-driving employees receive transportation allowance equivalent to the value of subsidized parking);
- Encourage use of telecommuting and flexible work schedules;
- Require that deliveries on-site take place during non-peak travel periods.

APPENDIX 13: AFFORDABLE APARTMENT FINANCIAL GAP ANALYSIS

Economic &

Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) was asked by the City of San José to compare the expected development costs for affordable housing units in Coyote Valley to the values that can be achieved for those units to determine the financing gap(s) that can be expected to result. This analysis may be used to inform policy discussions regarding the mix of incomes in Coyote Valley's affordable housing and the appropriate financial burden or responsibility of developers or other entities.

Basic Assumptions

To estimate the development costs for affordable rental units, EPS began by making the following broad assumptions:

1. The affordable rental units would be built by nonprofit developers whose cost structure may not be the same as a for-profit developer.
2. The affordable rental units would be provided in three-story buildings with surface parking or four-story buildings with podium parking.
3. The average rental unit would be two bedrooms and 911 square feet, and the cost and value calculations for this type of unit would be adequately representative of the average financial gap for all affordable rental units.
4. Between the three-story and four-story options, the direct costs of construction would vary only according to the type of parking provided (surface vs. podium) and the efficiency of the building (net leasable area to gross building size), as both building heights would be expected to be woodframe construction.
5. The indirect costs of development for both three- and four-story buildings would be the same percentage of direct costs, but would vary on a per-unit basis as a result of the different parking costs and efficiency ratios.

6. Land for affordable housing is assumed to be dedicated at no cost to nonprofit housing developers.

Methodology**Development Funding**

The development funding of affordable rental units are based on the total mortgage loan proceeds that can be supported by the annual net operating income stream. EPS has estimated the supportable mortgages of two-bedroom rental units at 60, 50, and 30 percent of Median Family Income (MFI) for a three-person household. Consistent with City policy and competitive requirements for affordable housing subsidies, EPS assumed that 30 percent of total income could be used for housing costs, including an allowance for utilities estimated at \$66 per month according to the Santa Clara County's "Schedule of Allowances for Tenant-Purchased Utilities and Other Services." To calculate the Net Operating Income for each unit, EPS then estimated the vacancy rate, the costs of operating expenses for the property managers/owners, and an appropriate capital reserve amount. For these assumptions, EPS received input from nonprofit housing providers represented on the Coyote Valley Affordable Housing Focus Group. To convert the Net Operating Income to a supportable mortgage loan, key variables included a 1.15 debt coverage ratio, 30-year repayment period and 5.45 percent interest rate, as prescribed by the California Housing Finance Agency

for tax-exempt financing. Neither rents nor operating expenses are assumed to escalate in this calculation. These cost and revenue estimates and analyses are shown in Table 1.

Development Costs

EPS and a construction cost estimator (Lee Saylor Associates) had estimated the development costs for three- and four-story multifamily units in summer 2004, and EPS had updated those cost estimates to reflect documented cost increases through 2005. Rather than simply using those cost estimates, however, EPS sought additional input from a variety of knowledgeable entities represented on the CVSP Affordable Housing Focus Group. Several nonprofit housing developers reviewed EPS's assumptions and provided pro formas from their own most recent comparable development projects, as well as input from their own construction contractors.¹ In addition, the City of San José provided detailed cost information from nine affordable housing projects in which the City is currently participating financially. From these inputs, EPS was able to identify the range and average of various cost inputs and unit sizes and, with input from Focus Group members, select cost estimates believed to be representative for Coyote Valley. These cost estimates and analyses are incorporated into the financial gap analyses shown on Tables 2 and 3.

¹ Since confidentiality of information has been guaranteed, none of the sources can be disclosed.

Financial Gap Findings

Financial Gaps Without Outside Funding

Comparing the development costs per unit (excluding land) to the achievable mortgage loan for these units, EPS has estimated the financial gap that must be filled to enable development of rental housing affordable at various income levels. Table 2 shows the financial gap calculations for the three-story buildings with surface parking. Table 3 shows the same information for the four-story buildings with podium parking. The results are summarized as shown at right.

Greater subsidies are required for four-story apartments with podium parking because of the much higher cost of podium parking compared to surface parking, and the lower building efficiency ratio.

Income Level	Financial Gap per 2-BR Unit without Outside Subsidy	
	3-Story with Surface Parking	4-Story with Podium Parking
30% of MFI	\$236,120	\$298,082
50% of MFI	\$167,808	\$229,770
60% of MFI	\$133,652	\$195,614

Financial Gaps With Outside Funding Sources

The financial gap calculations above were determined *without* inclusion of potential revenues from different funding sources such as tax exempt bonds, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, redevelopment set-asides, etc. While such sources could substantially reduce the financing gaps, there has not yet been a policy position stated about the use or availability of such funding sources to support affordable housing in Coyote Valley. BRIDGE Housing, a nonprofit affordable housing builder represented on the Focus Group, prepared an analysis of the value of affordable housing tax credits as applied to

prototypical development in Coyote Valley (see Table 4). Table 5 recalculates the financial gaps for affordable units assuming that the construction costs of each unit are reduced by the values of the four-percent and nine-percent tax credits. Comparing these financial gap figures to those with no outside funding sources, it is clear that tax credits or other funding sources can have a highly positive effect on the feasibility of affordable housing development, and are particularly critical to subsidize units for the lowest income households. It is also clear that, even with tax credits, land dedication alone will not fully subsidize the construction of affordable rental units in Coyote Valley.

APPENDIX 13, TABLE 1: AFFORDABLE UNIT MORTGAGE ASSUMPTIONS AND CALCULATIONS

Item	60% of MFI	50% of MFI	30% of MFI
MFI (2005 Est. by HUD for 3-person HH)	\$95,500	\$95,500	\$95,500
MFI Category	60.0%	50.0%	30.0%
Income Limit	\$57,300	\$47,750	\$28,650
Affordable Rent Limits/Year (30% of income limit)	\$17,190	\$14,325	\$8,595
Less Utility Costs/Year ¹	\$792	\$792	\$792
Less Vacancy Losses/Year	5%	5%	5%
Less Operating Expenses/Year	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500
Less Capital Reserves (\$/Unit/Year)	\$300	\$300	\$300
Annual Net Operating Income	\$10,778	\$8,056	\$2,613
Debt Coverage Ratio Required ²	1.15	1.15	1.15
Income Available for Annual Mortgage Repayment	\$9,372	\$7,006	\$2,272
Mortgage Interest Rate ²	5.45%	5.45%	5.45%
Mortgage Repayment Period (years) ²	30	30	30
Loan Fee ²	1.25%	1.25%	1.25%
Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789

¹ Based on \$66 per month utility total for a two bedroom unit as derived from the Schedule of Allowances for Tenant-Purchased Utilities and Other Services for Santa Clara County, October 1 '05.

² Mortgage debt coverage ratio, interest rate, term, and loan fees based on California Housing Finance Agency requirements as of December, 2005.

Sources: Non-profit housing developers; BRIDGE Housing Corporation; CalHFA; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

APPENDIX 13, TABLE 2: FINANCING GAP ANALYSIS FOR 3-STORY APARTMENTS WITH SURFACE PARKING

Item	60% of MFI	50% of MFI	30% of MFI
Development Program			
Avg. Unit Size (Net Square Feet)	911	911	911
Efficiency Ratio	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%
Gross Unit Size	1,024	1,024	1,024
Parking Ratio	1.5	1.5	1.5
Unit Values			
MFI (2005 Est. by HUD for 3-person HH)	\$95,500	\$95,500	\$95,500
MFI Category	60.0%	50.0%	30.0%
Income Limit	\$57,300	\$47,750	\$28,650
Affordable Rent Limits/Year (30% of income limit)	\$17,190	\$14,325	\$8,595
Less Utility Costs/Year	\$792	\$792	\$792
Less Vacancy Losses/Year	5%	5%	5%
Less Operating Expenses/Year	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500
Less Capital Reserves (\$/Unit/Year)	\$300	\$300	\$300
Annual Net Operating Income	\$10,778	\$8,056	\$2,613
Debt Coverage Ratio	1.15	1.15	1.15
Annual Mortgage Repayment	\$9,372	\$7,006	\$2,272
Mortgage Interest Rate	5.45%	5.45%	5.45%
Mortgage Repayment Period (years)	30	30	30
Loan Fee	1.25%	1.25%	1.25%
Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789
Development Costs			
Direct Construction Costs/Gross Bldg SF	\$148	\$148	\$148
Direct Construction Costs/Unit	\$151,648	\$151,648	\$151,648
Direct Surface Parking Construction Costs/Space	\$2,706	\$2,706	\$2,706
Direct Surface Parking Construction Costs/Unit	\$4,059	\$4,059	\$4,059
Site Improvement Cost/Gross Bldg SF	\$23	\$23	\$23
Direct Site Improvement Costs/Unit	\$23,606	\$23,606	\$23,606
In-tract Cost/Gross Bldg SF	\$6	\$6	\$6
In-tract Cost/Unit	\$6,142	\$6,142	\$6,142
Indirect Costs as % of Direct Costs	45.0%	45.0%	45.0%
Indirect Costs per Unit with Surface Parking	\$83,455	\$83,455	\$83,455
Total Costs per Unit with Surface Parking	\$268,909	\$268,909	\$268,909
Financing Gap (Development Costs—Unit Value)	\$133,652	\$167,808	\$236,120

Source: BRIDGE Housing Corporation; Affordable housing developers; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

APPENDIX 13, TABLE 3: FINANCING GAP ANALYSIS FOR 4-STORY APARTMENTS WITH PODIUM PARKING

Item	60% of MFI	50% of MFI	30% of MFI
Development Program			
Avg. Unit Size (Net Square Feet)	911	911	911
Efficiency Ratio	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Gross Unit Size	1,139	1,139	1,139
Parking Ratio	1.5	1.5	1.5
Unit Values			
MFI (2005 Est. by HUD for 3-person HH)	\$95,500	\$95,500	\$95,500
MFI Category	60.0%	50.0%	30.0%
Income Limit	\$57,300	\$47,750	\$28,650
Affordable Rent Limits/Year (30% of income limit)	\$17,190	\$14,325	\$8,595
Less Utility Costs/Year	\$792	\$792	\$792
Less Vacancy Losses/Year	5%	5%	5%
Less Operating Expenses/Year	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500
Less Capital Reserves (\$/Unit/Year)	\$300	\$300	\$300
Annual Net Operating Income	\$10,778	\$8,056	\$2,613
Debt Coverage Ratio	1.15	1.15	1.15
Annual Mortgage Repayment	\$9,372	\$7,006	\$2,272
Mortgage Interest Rate	5.45%	5.45%	5.45%
Mortgage Repayment Period (years)	30	30	30
Loan Fee	1.25%	1.25%	1.25%
Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789
Development Costs			
Direct Construction Costs/Gross Bldg SF	\$148	\$148	\$148
Direct Construction Costs/Unit	\$168,708	\$168,708	\$168,708
Direct Podium Parking Construction Costs/Space	\$17,590	\$17,590	\$17,590
Direct Podium Parking Construction Costs/Unit	\$26,385	\$26,385	\$26,385
Site Improvement Cost/Gross Bldg SF	\$23	\$23	\$23
Direct Site Improvement Costs/Unit	\$26,261	\$26,261	\$26,261
In-tract Cost/Gross Bldg SF	\$6	\$6	\$6
In-tract Cost/Unit	\$6,833	\$6,833	\$6,833
Indirect Costs as % of Direct Costs	45.0%	45.0%	45.0%
Indirect Costs per Unit with Surface Parking	\$102,684	\$102,684	\$102,684
Total Costs per Unit with Podium Parking	\$330,871	\$330,871	\$330,871
Financing Gap (Development Costs—Unit Value)	\$195,614	\$229,770	\$298,082

Source: BRIDGE Housing Corporation; Affordable housing developers; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

APPENDIX 13, TABLE 4: VALUE OF LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS

Tax Credit Calculation	9% Tax Credit		4% Tax Credit	
	Non Elevator	Elevator	Non Elevator	Elevator
Federal Tax Credit				
Eligible Basis Limit per Unit	\$127,158	\$134,143	\$127,158	\$134,143
Allowed Boosts to Basis:				
Structured Parking	0%	7%	0%	7%
Payment of Prevailing Wage	20%	20%	20%	20%
Day Care Center Included	0%	0%	0%	0%
Special Needs Population Served	0%	0%	0%	0%
Energy Efficient Technologies Used	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tax Exempt Bond Financing	0%	0%	80%	80%
Adjusted Eligible Basis	\$152,590	\$170,362	\$254,316	\$277,676
Tax Credit Rate	8.40%	8.40%	3.40%	3.40%
Annual Credit	\$12,818	\$14,310	\$8,647	\$9,441
10-year Value	\$128,175	\$143,104	\$86,467	\$94,410
Sale of 99.99% Interest	\$128,162	\$143,089	\$86,459	\$94,400
Sale Price	90%	90%	100%	100%
Value of Federal Tax Credit per Unit	\$115,346	\$128,780	\$86,459	\$94,400
Sales Tax Credit				
Adjusted Eligible Basis	\$152,590	\$170,362	n/a	n/a
Tax Credit %	30%	30%		
Total State Tax Credit	\$45,777	\$51,108		
Sale of 99.99% Interest	\$45,772	\$51,103		
Sale Price:	70%	70%		
Value of State Tax Credit Per Unit	\$32,041	\$35,772		
Combined Value of Federal and State Credit/Unit	\$147,387	\$164,553	\$86,459	\$94,400

1. Assumes 2-bedroom Unit.
2. Assumes basis boosts that are most likely.
3. Assumes 9% application competitive enough to win state credits as well.
4. Assumes San José continues to be in non-high cost areas as designated by HUD.

Sources: BRIDGE Housing Corporation, January 9, 2006; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

APPENDIX 13, TABLE 5: FINANCING GAP ANALYSIS INCLUDING ESTIMATED TAX CREDIT PROCEEDS

Item	60% of MFI	50% of MFI	30% of MFI
With 4% Tax Credit			
Three-Story Buildings with Surface Parking			
Total Development Costs per Unit with <i>Surface</i> Parking	\$268,909	\$268,909	\$268,909
Less "4% Tax Credit" Value ¹	\$86,459	\$86,459	\$86,459
<i>Less Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds</i>	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789
Financing Gap (Unit Value—Development Costs)	(\$47,193)	(\$81,349)	(\$149,661)
Four-Story Buildings with Podium Parking			
Total Development Costs per Unit with <i>Podium</i> Parking	\$330,871	\$330,871	\$330,871
Less "4% Tax Credit" Value ¹	\$94,400	\$94,400	\$94,400
<i>Less Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds</i>	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789
Financing Gap (Unit Value—Development Costs)	(\$101,213)	(\$135,369)	(\$203,681)
With 9% Tax Credit			
Three-Story Buildings with Surface Parking			
Total Development Costs per Unit with <i>Surface</i> Parking	\$268,909	\$268,909	\$268,909
Less "9% Tax Credit" Value ¹	\$147,387	\$147,387	\$147,387
<i>Less Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds</i>	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789
Financing Gap (Unit Value—Development Costs)	\$0	(\$20,421)	(\$88,733)
Four-Story Buildings with Podium Parking			
Total Development Costs per Unit with <i>Podium</i> Parking	\$330,871	\$330,871	\$330,871
Less "9% Tax Credit" Value ¹	\$164,553	\$164,553	\$164,553
<i>Less Total Supportable Mortgage Proceeds</i>	\$135,257	\$101,101	\$32,789
Financing Gap (Unit Value—Development Costs)	(\$31,061)	(\$65,217)	(\$133,529)

¹ Tax Credit values have been estimated by BRIDGE Housing Corporation, as shown on Table 4.

Source: "Affordable Housing Finance" magazine's "Affordable Housing Handbook"; BRIDGE Housing Corporation; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

APPENDIX 14: GREEN BUILDING DESIGN MEASURES

The following green building design measures should be utilized to enhance sustainability within new development.

Site Design

New development should incorporate passive solar orientation to optimize solar access.

Building HVAC and Appliances

- Insulate all hot water pipes and install On-Demand Hot Water Circulation System
- Use engineered parallel piping
- Install High Efficiency Toilets (Toilets that use less than 1.3 gallons per flush (gpf)) called High-Efficiency Toilets (HETs). This category of fixture includes dual-flush toilets, 1.0-gpf pressure-assist toilets, and conventional gravity fed toilets.)
- Install ENERGY STAR® Appliances
- Install separate garage exhaust fans
- Design and install HVAC System to ACCA recommendations
- Install Sealed Combustion (Direct Vent) furnaces and water heaters
- Install ENERGY STAR® ceiling fans with CFLs
- Install Ventilation System for Nighttime Cooling
- Install air conditioning with Non-HCFC Refrigerants
- Install High Efficiency HVAC Filter

- Install Zoned, Hydronic Radiant Heating with Slab Edge Insulation
- Install tankless water heaters
- Install water heaters with Energy Factor >0.62
- Install High Efficiency Furnace (AFUE 90 % or higher)
- Install High Efficiency Air Conditioner (SEER >13) with a Thermostatic Expansion Valve (TXV)

Building Architecture & Materials

- Design and build Energy STAR®'s High Performance Homes
- Meet ENERGY STAR®'s Indoor Air Quality Package Requirements
- Install Solar Water Heating System
- Install Photovoltaic (PV) Panels where possible
- Reduce solar heat gain through exterior surfaces by using light exterior colors or paints with reflective pigments
- Incorporate a minimum 30% Flyash in concrete in foundations and parking garages
- Apply Optimal Value Engineering (Advanced Framing)
- Use Engineered Lumber

- Use FSC-Certified Wood for framing
- Use Oriented Strand Board (OSB) for subfloor and sheathing
- Reduce pollution entering the building from the garages—Tightly seal the air barrier between garage and habitable areas
- Use recycled-content decking (avoid virgin plastic) Install recycled-content insulation
- Install Insulation that is low emitting for formaldehyde and volatile organic compounds (Certified Section 01350)
- Use Low-VOC or Zero-VOC Paint
- Use Low-VOC, water-based wood finishes
- Use Low-VOC Adhesives and Caulks
- Provide permanent walk-off mats at building entrances
- Use rapidly renewable trim materials
- Use recycled-content materials
- Reduce Formaldehyde in Interior Finishes
- Use rapidly renewable flooring materials
- Use recycled-content ceramic tiles
- Use flooring that is low-emitting (Section 01350 or Green Label Plus)

Construction Measures

- Protect ducts during construction and clean all ducts before occupancy

APPENDIX 16: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Ac-ft/yr: Acre-feet per year

ACE: Altamont Commuter Express

ARWT: Advanced Recycled Water Treatment

Bailey “Over the Hill”: Bailey Avenue, improvements to arterial standards west of Coyote Valley into the Almaden Valley (as shown on the General Plan Land Use Transportation Diagram).

BART: Bay Area Rapid Transit

Bio-Swale: Landscaped area used to filter stormwater.

BMPs: Post-Construction Best Management Practices. BMPs are defined as methods, activities, maintenance procedures, or other management practices for reducing the amount of pollution entering a water body.

BRT: Bus Rapid Transit. A self-powered rubber tired vehicle that travels on the dedicated, fixed guideway where it has signal preemption (or when necessary on regular city streets).

C-3 Permit: The City of San José’s development review process to control the flow of stormwater and stormwater pollutants from new and redeveloped sites.

CDFA: California Department of Food and Agriculture

CCOF: California Certified Organic Farmers

Central Commons: A linear park ranging in width from 100 feet to 300 feet and including school sites with shared ballfields, connecting Coyote Creek Corridor to realigned Fisher Creek Corridor.

CEQA: The California Environmental Quality Act. In general, CEQA requires that all private and public projects be reviewed prior to approval for their potential adverse effects upon the environment.

City Council: The City of San José’s legislative body. The City Council is comprised of the Mayor, who is elected by the community at-large, and ten councilmembers who are elected by districts. They are responsible for enacting ordinances, imposing taxes, making appropriations, establishing policy, and hiring some city officials. The Council adopts the local general plan, zoning, and subdivision ordinance.

COP: California Organic Program, Sacramento

Core, The: The town center of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan.

CVSP: Coyote Valley Specific Plan

DOT: City of San José Department of Transportation

DU/AC: Dwelling units per acre

EIR: Environmental Impact Report. A detailed review of a proposed project, its potential adverse impacts upon the environment, measures that may avoid or reduce those impacts, and alternatives to the project.

ELI: Extremely Low-Income. Households earning less than 30% of the area median income.

F.A.R.: Floor area ratio. A ratio of floor area of a structure to the area of a lot.

FEMA: Federal Emergency Management Agency

General Plan: The City of San José’s long term plan for development. A statement of policies, including text and diagrams setting forth objectives, principles, standards and plan proposals, for the future physical development of the city.

Greenbelt: South Coyote Valley area planned as a non-urban buffer between the City of San José and the City of Morgan Hill.

Hamlet, The: The historic village in Coyote Valley.

HOV: High Occupancy Vehicles (e.g. express shuttles, carpools, etc.)

HMP: Hydromodification Management Plan. Delineates areas where increases in post-project runoff may result in increased potential for erosion or other adverse impacts and proposes methods of managing such situations to maintain the pre-project discharge rates and/or durations after development.

HUD: Housing and Urban Development

ID: Industry-Driving. Jobs that help promote new industry in San José. (Includes all jobs except government, quasi-public and retail jobs.)

JPB: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

LAFCO: Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission. A State mandated local agency set up to oversee the boundaries of cities and special districts.

Lake: The Coyote Valley Lake in the town center.

LEED: Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design

LI: Low-Income. Households earning less than 80% of the area median income.

LRT: Light Rail Transit

MEC: Metcalf Energy Center

Median: The landscaped area between vehicular travel lanes.

Mgd: million gallons per day

MHUSD: Morgan Hill Unified School District

Mixed-Use: Lower floor commercial with office and/or residential above.

MOD: Moderate Income. Households earning between 81%-120% of the area median income.

MU1: Mixed-use 1. Typically six-story live work loft/town homes with district parking for jobs and on-site parking for residences.

MU2: Mixed-use 2. Typically three floors of office over either neighborhood or regional commercial.

MU3: Mixed-use 3. Typically two or three floors of residential over optional office or commercial.

MU4: Mixed-use 4. Typically three or four floors of residential over either neighborhood or regional commercial.

MU5: Mixed-use 5. This designation provides for 18 floors of residential over four floors of office. The floor area ratio (FAR) is 3.6.

Negative Declaration: A written statement by the City of San José briefly describing the reasons that a proposed project, not exempt from CEQA, will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIR.

NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act

NFIP: National Flood Insurance Program

Non-ID: Non-industry-driving jobs.

Non-Urban Buffer: An area without urban development.

NPDES: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

PDO/PIO: Parkland Dedication/Park Impact Ordinance

PG&E: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

PRNS: The City of San José Department of Parks Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department

Promenade, Lakeside: The pedestrian-oriented area surrounding the Coyote Valley Lake.

Public Realm: The area devoted to public uses (e.g. parks, schools, libraries, etc.).

R&D: Research and Development

RCB: Reinforced concrete box

Recharge Ponds: Ponds that recharge the groundwater.

Riparian Corridor, Coyote Valley: The Coyote Creek and Fisher Creek Corridors in Coyote Valley.

RWQCB: California Regional Water Quality Control Board

SCVURPPP: Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program

SCVWD: The Santa Clara Valley Water District. The primary water resources agency for Santa Clara County.

SFO: San Francisco International Airport

Smart-Growth: Comprehensive planning to guide, design, develop, revitalize and build communities for all that have a unique sense of community and place, preserve and enhance valuable natural and cultural resources, equitably distribute the costs and benefits of development, expand the range of transportation, employment and housing choices in a fiscally responsible manner, value long-range, regional considerations of sustainability over short term incremental geographically isolated actions, and promotes public health and healthy communities.

Specific Plan: A plan addressing land use distribution, open space availability, infrastructure, and infrastructure financing for a portion of the community. Specific plans put the provisions of the general plan into action.

SRO: Single Room Occupancy Residential Use

Sustainability: The capacity to equitably meet the vital human needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by preserving and protecting the area's ecosystems and natural resources (as defined by the American Planning Association).

Sustainable Design: Strives to strike a balance among the needs of people, nature, and the built environment. It is an approach that recognizes the long-term benefits of consuming fewer resources, saving energy, and conserving water, which will help to minimize impacts to the environment.

TAC Coyote Valley: Technical Advisory Committee advisory to the CVSP Task Force.

Task Force: The 20-member Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force, appointed by the San José City Council.

TCMs: Treatment Control Measures

TDM: Transportation Demand Management. Measure to minimize use of single occupant vehicles and encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit alternatives.

Transit-Oriented Development: Development that is organized around transit and that promotes the use of transit.

Tri-Valley: The Tri-Valley region of California is based around the San Francisco Bay Area cities of Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin and San Ramon in the three valleys from which it takes its name: Amador Valley, Livermore Valley and San Ramon Valley.

UPRR: Union Pacific Railroad

Urban Canal: Coyote Valley Urban Canal helps to aerate the lake, convey stormwater runoff.

Urban Reserve: Areas which may be appropriate for urban development and inclusion in the City of San José's Urban Service Area in the future when circumstances are appropriate. The Urban Reserve designation enables the City to plan and phase growth based on the need and ability to provide the necessary facilities and services to support additional residential growth.

USA: Urban Service Area. The area in the City where urban services are, or will be, available to serve urban development.

USDA: United States Department of Agriculture

VTA: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. An independent special district responsible for bus and light rail operations, congestion management, specific highway improvement projects, and countywide transportation planning.

VLI: Very Low-Income. Households earning less than 50% of the area median income.

WPCP: San José/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant

Zoning: Local codes regulating the use and development of property. The zoning ordinance divides the city or county into land use districts or "zones" represented on zoning maps, and specifies the allowable uses within each of those zones. It establishes development standards for each zone, such as minimum lot size, maximum height of structures, building setbacks, and yard size.

100-Year Flood Zone: Area that is subject to flooding once in 100 years on the average; equivalent to the one percent annual chance of flood (as determined by the US Federal Emergency Management Agency).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people are gratefully acknowledged for their contribution to the development of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan.

Mayor and City Council

Mayor Ron Gonzales
Linda J. LeZotte, District 1
Forrest Williams, District 2
Cindy Chavez, District 3
Chuck Reed, District 4
Nora Campos, District 5
Ken Yeager, District 6
Madison P. Nguyen, District 7
David D. Cortese, District 8
Judy Chirco, District 9
Nancy Pyle, District 10

Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force

Councilmember Forrest Williams, District 2, Co-Chair
Councilmember Nancy Pyle, District 10, Co-Chair
Supervisor Don Gage, County Supervisor
Chuck Butters, Brandenburg-Butters
Eric Carruthers, Retired Planner
Helen Chapman, San José Parks and Recreation Commission
Pat Dando, San José-Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce (Former Vice Mayor)
Russ Danielson, Former Board Member, MHUSD
Gladwyn D'Souza, Bicycle Advisory Commission
Craig Edgerton, Silicon Valley Land Conservancy
Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, South Bay AFL-CIO
Dan Hancock, Shapell Industries
Melissa Hippard, Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter
Doreen Morgan, San José Senior Commission
Chris Platten, San José Planning Commission
Ken Saso, Property Owner
Steve Schott Jr., Citation Homes
Steve Speno, Gibson and Speno
Neil Struthers, Santa Clara and San Benito Counties Building and Construction Trades

Former Task Force Members

Ron Gonzales, Mayor and Former Co-Chair
Amy Dean, Formerly of South Bay AFL-CIO
Terry Watt, Formerly of Silicon Valley Conservation Council
Jim Cunneen, Formerly of San José-Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce

Urban Design/Land Planning Consultants

Dahlin Group

Doug Dahlin, President
Roger Shanks, Principal/Senior Planner
Mercedes Trujillo, Exec. Admin. Assistant
Padru Kang, Project Manager
Justin Doull, Associate Planner
Jack Hsu, Associate Planner
Stephanie Chang, Junior Planner
Paula Buzatu, Digital Graphic Artists

KenKay Associates

Ken Kay, FALSA, Principal
Paul Barber, Senior Associate
Bruce Fukuji, AIA, Senior Associate
Cindy Hui, Associate
Yasmine Farazian, Professional Staff
Anna Felecio-Price, Administration
Eunjin Kim, Professional Staff
Craig Kay, Administration

Development Design Group

Michael Alston, Principal

Crawford Multari & Clark Associates

Paul C. Crawford, FAICP, CNU, President

Economic Consultants

Economic and Planning Systems

Jim Musbach, Managing Principal
Darin Smith, Senior Vice President
Teifion Rice-Evans, Senior Vice President
Paul Woods, Vice President
Jungjoo Pak, Senior Associate

Facilitation and Outreach

Apex Strategies

Eileen Goodwin, President

Art Direction/Design

Eric Gouldsberry Art Direction (EGAD)

Eric Gouldsberry, Art Director/Owner

Printing

Vision Press

Andy Nilon

Technical Consultants

David J. Powers and Associates

David J. Powers,
Judy Shanley, President
Jodi Starbird, Senior Project Manager

HMH Engineering

Bill Wagner, President
Jim Thompson, Project Manager
Howard Selznick, Senior Engineer
Mike Campbell, Senior Planner
Jennifer Moore, Design Engineer
Nabaz Saieed, Design Engineer
Leo Castillo, GIS Technician

Schaaf and Wheeler

Charles D. Anderson, P.E., Vice President/Project Manager
M. Eliza McNulty, P.E., Associate Engineer/Project Engineer
Erica J. Cruz, Assistant Engineer
Stephanie L. Conran, Assistant Engineer
Lise Shannon, Editor

Wetlands Research Associates

Mike Josselyn, President
Tom Fraser, Senior Wildlife Biologist
Phil Greer, Senior Plant Ecologist
Dana Riggs, Wildlife Biologist
Trina Schneider, Wildlife Biologist
Justin Davilla, Biologist
Becky Miller, Biologist
Justin Semion, Biologist
Chris Zumwait, GIS Manager

Hexagon Transportation Consultants

Gary Black, President
Mike Waller, Principal Associate
Robert Del Rio, Principle Associate
At van den Hout, Principle Associate
Massimo Loporto, Planner

Engeo, Inc.

Uri Eliahu, GE, President/Principle Engineer
Julia Moriarty, GE, Principle Engineer
Raymond Skinner, CEG, Associate Geologist
Kelly Krohn, Staff Engineer
Matthew Harrell, Staff Geologist
Anthony Schuetze, Staff Geologist

Basin Research Associates

Colin Busby, Principal
Melody Tannam, Archeologist

Lowney Associates

Ron Helm, President
Stason Foster, Associate

Public Agencies

Santa Clara Valley Water District

Melanie Richardson, Asst. Operating Office
Marc Klemencic, Exec. Program Manager
Barbara Judd, Senior Engineer
Bill Smith, Environmental. Planner II
Vince Stephens, Associate Engineer
Sean Rose, Associate Civil Engineer

Valley Transportation Authority

Mike Tasosa, Planning & Programming
Chris Augenstein, Congestion Management Program

Morgan Hill Unified School District

Alan Nishino, Superintendent
Bonnie Tognazzini, Deputy Superintendent
Peter Mandel, Board Member
Shelle Thomas, Board Member
Carolyn McKennan, (Former Superintendent)
Julie Zintsmaster, Sec. to Superintendent
Peggy Pappani, Exec. Secretary

City Staff

Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Joseph Horwedel, Director
 Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director
 Salifu Yakubu, Principal Planner
 Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner
 Susan Walsh, Senior Planner
 Michael Mena, Senior Planner
 Jared Hart, Planner II
 Sylvia Do, Planner I
 Stefanie Hom, Planner I
 Perihan Ozdemir, Geographic Systems Specialist
 Regina Mancera, Office Specialist II

City Attorney

Richard Doyle, City Attorney
 Renee Gurza, Senior Deputy City Attorney
 Vera Todorov, Senior Deputy City Attorney

City Managers Office

Les White, Interim City Manager
 Larry Lisenbee, Budget Director
 Kimberly Shunk, Emergency Services, Director

Department of Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services

Albert Belasco, Acting Director
 Scott Reese, (Former Deputy Director)
 Dave Mitchell, Parks Planning Manager
 Alina Kwak, Management Fellow
 Nancy Johnson

Department of Public Works

Katy Allen, Director
 Timm Borden, Deputy Director
 Harry Freitas, Deputy Director
 Primo DeGuzman, Acting Division Manager
 Ebrahim Sohrabi, Senior Civil Engineer
 Maria Angeles, Associate Civil Engineer
 Winnie Pagan, Associate Civil Engineer
 Gerry DeGuzman, Associate Civil Engineer
 Mike Shimamoto, City Geologist

Department of Transportation

Jim Helmer, Director
 Hans Larsen, Deputy Director
 Manuel Pineda, Senior Civil Engineer
 Luke Vong, Associate Civil Engineer

Environmental Services Department

John Stufflebean, Director
 Fran McVey, (Former Chief Deputy Director)
 Randy Shipes, Deputy Director
 Melody Tovar, Deputy Director
 Dale Ihrke (Muni Water), Deputy Director
 Mansour Nasser (Muni Water), Acting Deputy Director
 Mary Ellen Dick, Assistant to the Director
 Mary Tucker, Environmental Program Manager

Michael Foster, Environmental Service Specialist
 Diane Zarate, Supervisor Environmental Service Specialist
 Kirsten Struve, Supervisor Environmental Services Specialist
 Anastazia Aziz, Acting Supervisor Environmental Services Specialist
 Matt Krupp, Planner II

Finance Department

Scott Johnson, Director of Finance
 Julia Cooper, Deputy Director
 Lisa Taitano, Financial Analyst

Fire Department

Darryl Von Raesfeld, Assistant Fire Chief
 Geoff Cady, Administrative Officer
 Luis Da Silva, Senior Engineer
 Ed Tolentino, Senior Engineer

General Services

Peter Jensen, Director
 Juan Murillo, Custodial Supervisor
 Ken Korpi, Electrical Supervisor
 Paul Hamilton, Senior Electrician
 Rogelio Ascencio, Electrician
 Tim Brager, Electrician
 Frank Crusco, Electrician
 Martin Fontes, Electrician
 John Matteroli, Electrician
 Rich Sigona, Electrician
 John Wildemuth, Electrician

Housing Department

Leslye Krutko, Director
 Mike Meyer, Assistant Director
 Karen Wing, Division Manager
 Rebecca Flores, Senior Development Specialist
 Vivian Felix-Hart, Homeless Coordinator

Library Department

Jane Light, Director/City Librarian
 Richard Desmond, Deputy Director

Office of Cultural Affairs

Barbara Goldstein, Public Art Director
 JenJoy Roybal, Project Coordinator

Office of Economic Development

Paul Krutko, Director
 Kim Walesh, Assistant Director
 Nanci Klein, Corporate Outreach Manager
 Dhez Woodworth, Economic Development Officer

Police Department

Robert Davis, Police Chief
 William Miller, Police Officer
 Karen Johnson, Police Data Specialist II

Redevelopment Agency

Harry Mavrogenes, Executive Director

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Teresa Alvarado, Pacific Gas & Electric
 Jerry Amaro, Victory Outreach Church
 Chris Augenstein, Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA)
 Michele Beasley, Greenbelt Alliance
 Nancy Bernardi, Guadalupe-Coyote Resource
 Conservation District
 David Bischoff, City of Morgan Hill
 Shanna Boigon, Santa Clara County Association of Realtors
 Dale Bowyer, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality
 Control Board
 Craig Brion, Santa Clara Audubon Society
 Beverly Bryant, Home Builders Association of Northern California
 Dawn Cameron, Santa Clara County Roads and Airports
 Jennifer Castillo, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)
 Juliana Chow, Santa Clara Audubon Society
 Ann Draper, Santa Clara County Planning Department
 Craige Edgerton, Silicon Valley Land Conservancy (SVLC)
 Tedd Faraone, Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning
 Bobbie Fischler, League of Women Voters of California
 Jessica Fitchen, Greenbelt Alliance
 Mark Frederick, Santa Clara County Parks
 Mike Griffiths, Santa Clara County Roads and Airports
 Tracy Hemmeter, SCVWD
 Dave Higgins, SCVWD
 Theo Hipol, SCVWD
 Mary Hughes, Habitat for Humanity
 Anne Jamison, VTA
 Trixie Johnson, Friends of Coyote Greenbelt (FROG)
 Barbara Judd, SCVWD
 Wingate Lew, Caltrans
 Mike Lipman, SCVMDC

Libby Lucas, California Native Plant Society
 Jane Mark, Santa Clara County Parks
 Dennis Martin, National Association of Industrial Office Parks
 Carolyn McKennan, Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD)
 Richard McMurty, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality
 Control Board
 Kathy Molloy Previsich, City of Morgan Hill
 Kathryn Nation, Senator Bruce McPherson's Office
 Dunia Noel, Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation (LAFCO)
 Elizabeth Petrinovich, Office of Senator Abel Maldonado
 Julie Render, VTA
 Melanie Richardson, SCVWD
 Sean Rose, SCVWD
 Elish Ryan, Santa Clara County Parks
 Pat Sausedo, National Association of Industrial Office Parks
 Stephanie Schaaf, EHC LifeBuilders
 Brian Schmidt, Committee for Green Foothills
 Bill Shoe, Santa Clara County Planning & Development Dept.
 Kyle Simpson, Greenbelt Alliance
 Bill Smith, SCVWD
 Vivian Smith, Saint Louise Regional Hospital Daughters of Charity
 Tim Steele, Sobrato Development Corporation
 Vincent Stephens, SCVWD
 George Tacke, VTA
 Mike Tasosa, VTA
 Bonnie Tognazzini, MHUSD
 Rebecca Tolentino, City of Morgan Hill
 Brenda Torres-Barreto, Santa Clara Audubon Society
 Rebecca Van Dahlen, Santa Clara County Association of Realtors
 Kerry Williams, Coyote Housing Group
 Brian Wines, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality
 Control Board

Also, a special thank you

to the more than 1,600 people who have attended Task Force and community meetings, served on the sub-committees and focus groups, reviewed newsletters, provided input on line, and participated in the Specific Plan process in other ways.



